

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/774,691	LEHTONEN, TUOMO	

Examiner	Art Unit	
John E. Chapman	2856	

All Participants:

(1) John E. Chapman.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) Peter Flanagan.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 March 2008

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic

Video Conference

Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph.

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Amendment of claim 1 in order to use terminology in the specification, specifically to recite that the movable electrode is "supported by springs" rather than "arranged as a torsion beam," since the specification does not use the latter terminology.

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)